

**CONTINUATION OF INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The interview between the participants, Examiner Pasia and Mr. Phillips, was focused more on the claim language presented in the proposed claim amendments supplied by Mr. Phillips. Proposed claim amendments to claim 7 includes the claim limitations "a counter", and "a number of credits" which are not anticipated by Chapman reference. Agreement was reached on proposed amendments of claim 7, that Chapman reference does not disclose/anticipate "a counter" and "a number of credits. The same agreement also applies to the proposed amendments to claim 8.

Also, Mr. Phillips discussed the difference between the present application and the references used in the previous rejections, where the references, in general, mostly involves bandwidth allocation/reservation among router/switch systems. The present application deals with bandwidth allocation/reservation among computers (i.e. processing units). Examiner suggested to Mr. Phillips that in order to differentiate the processing units from routers/switches, it should be explicitly shown in the claim language and support should also be present in the specification.

Examiner also pointed out the possible 101 rejection (regarding a method claim being tied to a particular machine or apparatus) of the proposed claim 8. It is agreed upon, that Mr.

Art Unit: 2416

Phillips, will include revisions to the proposed amendments to claim 8, specifically showing at least one method claim tied to a machine or apparatus (i.e. "requesting by a processing unit...).

/Redentor M Pasia/

Examiner, Art Unit 2416